

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication in the outstanding office action that claims 1-10 and 23 are directed to allowable subject matter, and that claim 14 (dependent from claim 11) would be allowed if amended to be in independent form. Claim 14 has not been so amended because it is believed that claim 11 is allowable, for the reasons noted below.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 10-11, 14, 16, and 20-23 have been amended to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors and to ensure proper antecedent support for each of the recited claim elements. No new matter is entered.

It is noted that the Office Action does not indicate whether the Applicant's Response to Restriction Requirement filed on January 12, 2010 was persuasive and the restriction was withdrawn, or whether the restriction requirement is maintained as proper. Nor did page 1 of the Office Action indicate that claims 24 and 25 are withdrawn from consideration. Given that the Office Action did not address claims 24 and 25 on the merits, it is presumed that the restriction requirement has not been withdrawn; however, an indication in an Office Communication as to whether or not the Restriction Requirement is withdrawn is respectfully requested. See, MPEP 821.01.

Claims 11-13, 15-20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bevan et al. (US 2004/0162093) (hereinafter, "Bevan"). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bevan in view of Proctor et al. (US 2006/0098592).

It is respectfully submitted that the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 is directed to a wireless terminal apparatus and recites the features of:

“a generating section generating communication profile information containing information for a wireless communication scheme, used frequency bandwidth, communication start time, and/or a communication continuation time corresponding to a communication request in the event that the communication request occurs with another wireless terminal apparatus; and

a transmission section transmitting generated communication profile information to a management terminal apparatus (emphasis added)”

According to aspects of the wireless communication apparatus recited by claim 11, a wireless terminal apparatus transmits communication profile information related, for example, to a communication link between the wireless terminal apparatus and another wireless terminal apparatus (“first wireless terminal apparatuses”), to a management terminal apparatus. The management terminal apparatus then compares the received communication profile information with previously stored communication permission history related, for example, to another communication link between two other wireless terminal apparatuses (“second wireless terminal apparatuses”), and determines whether there is duplication in wireless resources. (Specification, paragraph [0067]). Based on this determination, the management terminal apparatus may either (1) permit communication between the first wireless communication apparatuses, (2) change the communication profile information (if possible) and then permit the communication between the first wireless communication apparatuses, or (3) deny the communication between the first wireless terminal apparatuses. (Specification, paragraph [0067]-[0070]). As a result, the wireless terminal apparatus recited by claim 11 reduces interference and improves

communication quality under a communication environment where a plurality of wireless communication schemes are mixed. (Specification, paragraph [0075]). (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to any particular aspect of the referenced embodiments.)

In contrast, Bevan is directed towards a method of synchronizing transmission between two nodes in a Wireless Community Area Network (“CAN”). (Bevan, paragraph [0021]). As shown in FIG. 2 of Bevan, a CAN includes a number of Wireless Access and Routing Points (WARPs) 20, interconnected by wireless links 22. The WARPS are wirelessly connected to each other and to the Network Access Point (NAP) 24, and the NAP 24 in turn is connected to a wired/fibre broadband backbone, which is likely to be connected to the Internet. (Bevan, paragraph [0052]). As shown in FIG. 3, the WARP 30 provides an access link 34 to mobile nodes (MNs) 36 and a Transit Link 38 to other WARPs or to a NAP. (Bevan, paragraph [0055]). The antenna on the WARP 30 is a “switched beam antennae” which generates a beam pattern of eight beams 41-48, as shown in FIG. 4. (Bevan, paragraph [0056]).

In order to measure interference between the WARPs and NAPs (i.e., the “network nodes” or “nodes”, Bevan, paragraph [0058]), Bevan discloses that each node has an interference table, as shown in FIG. 5. The interference table is a historical record of which slots within the multi-dimensional array of transmission slots have tended to suffer from interference. The interference table therefore gives an indication of the expected interference in a given transmission slot. The interference table may be supplied to the node, but preferably the table is independently created and maintained by each node within the network. (Bevan, paragraph [0063]). In order for adjacent nodes to agree on scheduled slots for transmission of packet data

between them, an initiating node signals to the proposed recipient with a proposal of a slot for a scheduled transmission. (Bevan, paragraph [0076]). The recipient, referring to its own interference table, may refuse the slot, propose a new slot, or accept the slot. (Id.). As a result, the adjacent nodes can find a “mutually convenient slot” for transmission of packet data between them. (Id.).

The interference measuring method disclosed by Bevan, which involves two adjacent nodes negotiating for a “mutually convenient slot” based on their own interference tables, is completely distinct from the invention recited by Applicants' claim 11, which involves at least three separate components (two wireless terminal apparatuses and a management terminal apparatus). In the rejection, the Office Action takes the position that the nodes shown in FIG. 2 (i.e., the WARPs 20 and the NAPs 24) anticipate the wireless terminal apparatus recited by Applicants' claim 11. As explained above, the recited wireless transmission apparatus includes “a transmission section transmitting generated communication profile information to a management terminal apparatus.” The Office Action argues that Bevan discloses the recited transmission section at paragraph [0063], which states:

“[t]he interference table may be supplied to the node, but preferably the table is independently created and maintained by each node within the network.”

However, this sentence merely describes how the node may receive an interference table, not how the node may transmit information from the interference table to a “management terminal apparatus,” as recited by Applicants' claim 11. Bevan fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, this recited transmission section, because the method taught by Bevan involves adjacent nodes negotiating with each other for a slot by using the interference tables, not

transmitting generated communication profile information to a third party, i.e., a management terminal apparatus, which in turn determines whether there is duplication in wireless resources between the two wireless terminal apparatuses. Thus, Bevan fails to disclose at least this recited feature of Applicants' claim 11, and the rejection of Applicants' claim 11 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Furthermore, as a result of this significant technical distinction, the method of Bevan is unable to achieve the same beneficial results achieved by the wireless terminal apparatus recited by Applicants' claim 11. As explained above, the wireless terminal apparatus recited by Applicants' claim 11 reduces interference between at least two different sets of wireless transmission apparatuses which might interfere with each other, for example, one set of wireless terminal apparatuses using IEEE802.11g and another set of wireless terminal apparatuses using Bluetooth. (Specification, paragraph [0075]). In contrast, the method disclosed by Bevan simply measures the interference between two “adjacent nodes” by implementing a negotiation process between the two adjacent nodes to find a “mutually convenient slot” for “transmission of packet data between them according to when both nodes have suitable slots within their interference tables (emphasis added).” (Bevan, paragraph [0075]). Thus, Bevan fails to disclose any mechanism to reduce interference between different sets of wireless communication devices, and is therefore unable to achieve the same beneficial results of the wireless terminal apparatus recited by Applicants' claim 11.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Bevan fails to disclose the above-noted subject matter of claim 11 and thus, claim 11 is not anticipated by Bevan. Claims 12-13 and 15-19 depend on claim 11. It is respectfully submitted that claims 12-13 and 15-19 are allowable due to their

dependence from allowable claim 11 and also due to their recitation of subject matter that provides an independent basis for their individual allowability.

Claim 20 recites a plurality of wireless terminal apparatuses, each of the wireless terminal apparatuses including “a transmission section transmitting generated communication profile information to the management terminal apparatus.” As explained above with respect to claim 11, Bevan fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, at least this recited feature of claim 20. Accordingly, Accordingly, The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons that the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

Claim 21 depends on claim 20. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons that the rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn.

Claim 22 recites a plurality of wireless terminal apparatuses, each of the wireless terminal apparatuses including “a transmission section transmitting the generated trigger signal to the management terminal apparatus.” As explained above with respect to claim 11, Bevan fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, at least this recited feature of claim 22, because the “nodes” of Bevan do not transmit a “generated trigger signal” to a “management terminal apparatus.” Accordingly, The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons that the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a personal communication, the Examiner is requested to e-mail the undersigned at the address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: June 3, 2010
JEL/DEA/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. L9289.6165
DICKINSON WRIGHT, PLLC
International Square
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202)-457-0160
Facsimile: (202)-659-1559
E-Mail: jledbetter@dickinsonwright.com

DC 9289-6165 153620